

Date: Wed, 6 Jan 93 04:30:30 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #6
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 6 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 6

Today's Topics:

 Closed repeaters (2 msgs)
 Closed Repeaters.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1993 03:05:06 GMT
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.cs.columbia.edu!popovich@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Closed repeaters
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Analogies are such fun! Warning, flame bait:

> So use the next road over that has plenty of open lanes, and goes the same
> places.

The problem is that the road that you are parked in is a wide, modern
Interstate highway, while the next road over is an ungraded cow path
that only certain premium-priced four-wheel drive vehicles can use
productively. To be more exact:

> Under the rules by which a LOT of repeaters were coordinated, they do in fact
> own that frequency. The simple fact of the matter is that you will not be able
> . to change that easily or cheaply, and you may well not be aboe to change it at
> all. Want to put up a repeater? Try 220, or 900, or 1200; there's plenty of
> spectrum out there just begging to be used.

Let's see now. If we're making analogies, like everyone here seems to be doing, 220 is a nice old highway through the country, part of which has already been condemned and dug up for construction, and the rest of which is under immediate threat of condemnation. The government wants to take the land (spectrum) it was built on in order to build a toll road for commercial vehicles only (UPS, or whoever will end up with the band now :-). Even so, a few hardy souls are still using it. (There's even one named W2AEE/R, a call sign near and dear to my own heart, since when any of us operates HF from the Columbia University club shack, we coincidentally use the call W2AEE. :-) 900 is full of psycho semi-trailer and bulldozer drivers who are sufficiently bigger than your car that they won't even notice if they hit you, but you'll get creamed (all of those other services that we are secondary to on that band). And finally, 1200 is a rough, undeveloped dirt track in the country with no gas stations, restaurants or support services of any kind, requiring a special, premium sort of 4x4 called a Gunnplexer in order to make use of it. It'll break an axle on any ordinary sedan (RF circuitry) that tries to roll over it and go somewhere :-). And face it, your standard mobile repeater user isn't going to be able to stick a microwave dish on the roof of his car, aim it at the repeater he wants to use, and keep it aimed while he's driving around. Any frequency where your transmission line is a waveguide just isn't going to work for mobile use. That kind of use simply demands good old omnidirectional VHF/UHF mobile antennas, while something like, say, a dedicated link in a sophisticated state-wide repeater system is quite happy to sit with a parabolic dish aimed at the next parabolic dish down the way, neither of which is going anywhere, except in the case of earthquakes if your system is in California :-).

Yes, it's a lot of fun to create analogies, but why would anybody think that it could possibly do us any good to do this?

-Steve

Date: 6 Jan 1993 04:36:06 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Closed repeaters
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

popovich@cs.columbia.edu (Steve Popovich) writes:

> Analogies are such fun! Warning, flame bait:

>

> > So use the next road over that has plenty of open lanes, and goes the same
> > places.

>

> The problem is that the road that you are parked in is a wide, modern
> Interstate highway, while the next road over is an ungraded cow path

> that only certain premium-priced four-wheel drive vehicles can use
> productively. To be more exact:

So say I've got this Porsche what has CTCSS controlling the brakes.
And the steering wheel has been replaced by a DTMF decoder and some
logic. Now this truck driver in the next lane....
:-)

Well, at least the discussion seems to have migrated to r.r.a.policy
where it belongs. Enjoy.

Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY

Date: 5 Jan 1993 20:51:52 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Closed Repeaters.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[Followups to .policy...]

In article <1993Jan5.195950.5210@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
mdc@vixen.cc.bellcore.com (marden,david c) writes:
>I feel that if at all possible the repeater coordinator(s) should
>reassign the pair in cases like this. Maybe the FCC should delegate
>the power to do this??

No coordinator would do so, for the simple reason that he'd get his ass sued
off. On what basis do you decide that that club gets kicked off the frequency?
Can you defend it in court? Can you even afford to defend it in court? You're
asking the coordinator to make a value judgment, and that way lie lawsuits.

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."
-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of All Fears_

Date: 5 Jan 1993 18:27:23 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1ialnnINnt37@transfer.stratus.com>, <8323@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1993Jan5.171347.2389@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>1

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

[Followups to rec.radio.amateur.policy, where this discussion belongs.]

In article <1993Jan5.171347.2389@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>The analogy of a private vehicle compared to a private repeater is
>totally flawed.

I agree, but was trying to deal with things as they were posted.

>No one is suggesting that anyone MUST turn over their
>private property to anyone else.

No, but they ARE arguing that all repeaters should be open if they wish to avoid being interfered with by other repeaters. That's equivalent to telling repeater owners what they can do with their repeaters, and that's as good as taking the repeater away from the owner.

>Sure you make the relays
>kerchunk and the circuits operate but the "owner" of that repeater
>is the responsible party to ensure an access arrangement that is
>private enough to eliminate those that s/he doesn't want to operate
>the private repeater.

...and it is this that the open repeater partisans are arguing against.

>As others have pointed out, this is really poor engineering if any
>system (repeater, computer, etc.) is that easily brought down by
>someone just "playing" with different codes. If a user
>needs to be that sophisticated then the access process must be
>that much more secure to eliminate all probability of a casual
>user inadvertently or deliberately gaining access and "crashing
>down" the system.

...but that requires that the repeater be closed, and that goes against the arguments that the open repeater partisans are making.

>Experimentation is and should be encouraged, but as with all experimentation
>there is also the risk of the unknown. Learning that someone punching
>up some indiscriminate touch-tone brings down the system would be
>the kind of thing that experimentation is supposed to find out
>and then modification and improvement is done to eliminate those
>shortcomings.

...which is what closed repeater owners do.

>No, if the access process is sophisticated and secure enough then no one

>but those "authorized" by Jim will be able to use the repeater. If Jim
>has no access control (or only a simple PL) then he can't expect that
>others aren't likely to just key up and use the repeater. Under
>those circumstances, Jim's only recourse, turn off the repeater
>or change the access process.

...and so the person gets on the output and keeps Jim from using the repeater
anyway, according to the arguments of the open repeater partisans. After all,
he doesn't own the frequency, right? Bah!

>Another point, why is the presumption here that the only possible situation
>is one in which "someone that doesn't like Jim" is deliberately trying
>to prevent Jim from using his repeater? I just don't like the concept of
>private repeaters in general because there's only a finite amount of
>support, limited to the area I live in, which I can "donate to" to
>sustain repeater operations. My travels (vacation/business/etc.) with which
>I usually bring an HT should not mean I need to lay out \$\$\$ to participate
>in the use of other repeaters elsewhere around the country on Amateur
>Frequencies I am fully licensed to operate on.

OK, so broaden the hypothetical to include people who don't like closed
repeaters. There have been a few jammers on Jim's system who have done it
because they didn't like closed repeaters.

Nobody is saying that transient users should be run off. Jim has said
repeatedly that he's only concerned about those who wish to use the machine
regularly but not support it like the rest of his users are doing.

There are still plenty of open repeaters, especially on 2 meters. If I travel,
and take my 440 handheld with me, I expect to have to tune around a while to
find a repeater I can use - regardless of open/closed status, I'd have to tune
around anyway. What's the difference?

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, The Sum of all Fears

Date: 5 Jan 1993 21:07:50 GMT
From: noc.near.net!transfer.stratus.com!bigbootay.sw.stratus.com!
leadfoot@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8323@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan5.165651.28417@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>,
<8333@lib.tmc.edu>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <8333@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
|> In article <1993Jan5.165651.28417@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

|> >The problem is, all the other lanes are blocked by other peoples' parked
|> >Porsches as well, and there are very few open lanes left.
|>

|> Only on that one freeway. There are other freeways that go from the same place
|> to the same place, and that are wide open.

Sure, but they are smaller, slower, and packed with big slow trucks :-)

The point is that the resource is being wasted by private groups who don't have the right to claim exclusive use of something they don't own. They may own their car, but they don't own the lane it is parked in. If you don't believe this just park your car in the middle of an interstate lane and watch what happens when the cops show up. HINT: your Porsche will not impress him enough to let you pull this crap.

|> >>Fortunately, the FCC disagrees with you.

|> >Actually, I think the FCC prohibits exclusive "ownership" of a frequency pair.

|> >They agree that you don't have to let someone else use your EQUIPMENT if you

|> >don't want to.

|>

|> The problem is that this leads to interference, and forcing someone to accept
|> interference to his repeater violates the agreement that let the ham community
|> tell him where to put it in the first place - "If you put your repeater here,
|> with these technical limits, we'll keep everyone else away" - and that's the
|> entire basis for frequency coordination in the first place. Now, we get back
|> to lawsuits.

Everyone has to accept and put up with interference for time to time. This ham radio, not ATT or ARInc. It may be a little painful at times, but tough. Traffic jams on the hiway are the same way, no one likes them but they are a fact of life. If you drive you have to deal with traffic.

|> >I didn't get this message at all. I thought that Mark was demanding that Jim
|> >park his Porsche in the garage when he is not using it so that a public bus
|> >could use the lane. It also seems Mark and others understand that when Jim is
|> >ready to go somewhere, he has first dibs on the lane (as long as he doesn't
|> >"run the bus off the road").

|>

|> ...but this is the rub: Jim _doesn't_ have "first dibs on the lane" if he has
|> to wait for the bus to lumber out of the way. You've just damaged, if not
|> destroyed, the usefulness of his repeater.

I wouldn't even say he gets first dibs! He just gets the same access everyone rights else does. If it is in use wait for your turn, just like

road traffic.

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 17:33:09 GMT

From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C052pD.3px@sunblossom.ge.com>, <1993Jan1.155038.24275@ke4zv.uucp>, <C08Bu6.8yw@NeoSoft.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: True and correct information

In article <C08Bu6.8yw@NeoSoft.com> jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:

>In article <1993Jan1.155038.24275@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>Sorry, this is not false information. Broadcast licensees have *always*
>>been responsible for the proper operation of their equipment. In addition,
>>the chief operator is also directly responsible for the operation of
>>the transmitting equipment, and (s)he must hold a General Radiotelephone
>>license.

>

>Not so. You must now only have a Restricted Radiotelephone Permit. The
>requirement that you have a General Radiotelephone went away several years
>ago.

Actually, the RRP, a write for this card sort of thing, was only required for control operators of certain directional radio stations, IE people who only turn things on and off. The chief operator does not require one since the GRT supercedes it. The chief operator need not ever *operate* the station for that matter. He is merely the person the licensee has designated as being *responsible* for the proper technical operation of the facility. He need not be a staff person at all. In common talk we would probably refer to him as Chief Engineer except that the Commission doesn't use that language, nor does it require the chief operator to have purchasing or hiring and firing priviledges normally associated with management personnel. The chief operator is the designated "goat" if any improper operations occur.

This has all become rather confusing since the Commission has deregulated in stages, and has applied different standards to directional, non-directional, and television broadcast operations. Our communications lawyers are still sending us bulletins on how to comply with the regulations in our TV and radio stations. One thing for sure, the GRT has not gone away and is required of the chief operator of a broadcast TV station. Ordinary operators don't even require the RRP, in fact they never have, they used to need the GRT too.

Gary
Senior Engineer Gannett Broadcast Group

And also:

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: 5 Jan 1993 22:57:19 GMT
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8323@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan5.171347.2389@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<8334@lib.tmc.edu>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:
>As others have pointed out, this is really poor engineering if any
>system (repeater, computer, etc.) is that easily brought down by
>someone just "playing" with different codes.

Oh? Ours is an experimental system. In your lab, do you make every
experiment absolutely perfect, foolproof, idiot-proof, and swab-proof
before you begin, or do you just hang a "Do Not Touch" sign on it.

That is, of course, assuming that you have a lab and do experiments,
which is probably an unwarranted assumption for most hams.

Look, dammit, I can upload new operating system code into the controller
among other things. That's part of the extreme flexibility of the
system. Unfortunately, like Mac and PCs, we pay for the simplicity
(or "stupidity") of the system with the kind of vulnerability.

Sure, it's possible to make those kinds of safeguards that will protect
against malicious intruders. But then, my system wasn't designed to
cope with people asserting their God-given rights to ratchet-jaw on
any frequency they can't hear someone already talking on. I assumed
a friendly (well, at least not actively hostile) community.

Now if what you're saying is that we no longer have a friendly
community, well, there are steps that can be taken. Let's hope
they won't become necessary.

- Brian

Date: 5 Jan 1993 21:14:12 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <lialnnINNt37@transfer.stratus.com>, <8323@lib.tmc.edu>,
<licr4sINNl08@transfer.stratus.com>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

[Followups to .policy...]

In article <licr4sINNl08@transfer.stratus.com> leadfoot@bigbootay.sw.stratus.com
(Mark Curtis) writes:

>Except he isn't the only person parking in the lanes. Hundreds of others
>have the same idea. Nobody has a problem with them using the road to drive
>on, it's using it for a private parking lot when they aren't that we have
>a problem with.

So use the next road over that has plenty of open lanes, and goes the same
places.

>You can't be that thick skulled, you must be playing dense to avoid my point.
>No one is saying he should be forced to play taxi driver. Just don't park
>the damn thing in the middle of the road when you aren't using it. Let
>someone else use the lane while you aren't. I realize not having to bother
>with other people is real handy, but it doesn't work that way.

Who says he's not using it just because it isn't moving? He could be waiting
for a passenger he's made an appointment to go to dinner with.

>You can spend all the money you want, but it isn't going to change the
>fact that you are using public property.

So? The repeater is useless without a fixed frequency on which to find it, and
to force him to share the frequency without his consent hinders his ability to
use his property.

[BBQ grill analogy posted for the second time deleted]

>I'm not saying you have to let them use your grill/repeater, just don't
>try to lay claim to public property by building something on it. If you
>don't want to share your stuff (take it home/shut it off) when you are
>done (using the park for the day/talking). That way someone else, who
>has equal an equal right to use the park, can get the full use of the
>park that you enjoyed. Claiming exclusive rights to part of the park
>wrongly deprives them of its full use. It isn't your's to claim.

A barbecue grill doesn't lose its utility if you pick it up and move it. A

repeater does.

Besides, the situation is more like the city telling you that you can build that grill there, and keep others from using it, and then telling you after you've built a \$10K grill complete with smokers, rotisseries, and gold-plated tongs that now you have to let everyone use it. Is that fair?

>I'm not saying don't put up a repeater. Just don't get this "I own this
>pair stay the hell off it" attitude. You don't own anything except your
>repeater hardware and attitude. If someone you don't like starts using
>the machine turn it off. Getting on with an "I own this freq" attitude is
>wrong and silly. Just turn your repeater off, that is the only thing you
>do own and control.

Getting on with an "I can transmit anywhere I damned well please, and you can't stop me" attitude is wrong and silly.

If I were to follow your words, then someone who doesn't like me or my repeater can force me to keep it off the air, thus depriving me of the use of it. Is that fair?

Under the rules by which a LOT of repeaters were coordinated, they do in fact own that frequency. The simple fact of the matter is that you will not be able to change that easily or cheaply, and you may well not be aboe to change it at all. Want to put up a repeater? Try 220, or 900, or 1200; there's plenty of spectrum out there just begging to be used.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of All Fears_

Date: Tue, 05 Jan 93 00:12:52 GMT

From: psinntp!newsserver.pixel.kodak.com!laidbak!tellab5!balr!ttd.teradyne.com!
news@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <uJZTwB1w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca>,

<1993Jan3.053500.18260@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>, <1993Jan04.042108.17562@ssc.com>

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan04.042108.17562@ssc.com>, tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

> In article <1993Jan3.053500.18260@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>>In article <uJZTwB1w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca> emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca writes:

>>>>

>>>I would agree with you if I made that assumption. It's certainly possible
>>>(though careless) to operate simplex unintentionally on a repeater input.
>>>If you or I inadvertently operate that way, and we had it brought to our
>>>attention, we'd apologize, and change frequency.
>>>
>>>The impression I got from the previous poster was that he felt it was his
>>>right to operate anywhere in the band he felt like, and whether or not it
>>>brought up a repeater - as long as he couldn't hear anyone else on the
>>>channel.
>>>
>>
>>You're right, I would apologize and attempt to change frequency, which might
>>be impossible in Southern California if the single 440 MHz simplex frequency
>>was in use. I feel like it **IS** the previous poster's right to operate
>>simplex unintentionally on a repeater input. I feel like it is the previous
>>poster's right to operate **INTENTIONALLY** on a repeater's input frequency
>>*_PROVIDED_IT_IS_NOT_CAUSING_INTERFERENCE_TO_ANOTHER_QSO_*. While I may only
>>be a No-Code, I can read English. All the regulations I have read and seen
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> Geeze.....I thought we were discussing this with someone who has long
> and distinguished experience with frequency coordination and FM repeaters!
>
> Not to diminish the talents or abilities of a new ham, but it might
> be a good idea to ask some questions about the subject, rather than
> making all of these dire pronouncements based upon armchair lawyering!
>

Ahhh, but he can read (and has read) the rules. This certainly makes him as
qualified to discuss the rules as anyone else who has read the rules. Are
you so elitist that you don't undersand that kind of simple fact ?

j.

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 23:13:00 GMT
From: usc!rpi!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8323@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan5.165651.28417@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>,
<8333@lib.tmc.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <8333@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>In article <1993Jan5.165651.28417@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:
>>Actually, I think the FCC prohibits exclusive "ownership" of a frequency pair.

>>They agree that you don't have to let someone else use your EQUIPMENT if you
>>don't want to.

>

>The problem is that this leads to interference, and forcing someone to accept
>interference to his repeater violates the agreement that let the ham community
>tell him where to put it in the first place - "If you put your repeater here,
>with these technical limits, we'll keep everyone else away" - and that's the
>entire basis for frequency coordination in the first place. Now, we get back
>to lawsuits. I still haven't heard anyone volunteer to pick up the legal
>expenses for coordinating bodies that try this.

Sorry, coordinators have no legal right to make this promise to keep everyone else away. They are forbidden by 97.101(b) from granting exclusive use to any one station. The doctrine of nullification says that private agreements have no legal force if they are in contravention of law. Since a promise of exclusive use is a violation of 97.101(b), it has no force.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1993 00:33:09 GMT

From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8323@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan5.171347.2389@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<8334@lib.tmc.edu>

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <8334@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>No, but they ARE arguing that all repeaters should be open if they wish to
>avoid being interfered with by other repeaters. That's equivalent to telling
>repeater owners what they can do with their repeaters, and that's as good as
>taking the repeater away from the owner.

I believe you are incorrect. I understand that they are arguing that they have the right to use the frequencies on which closed repeaters operate, provided they abide by the regulations which govern amateur radio (ie no interference, etc.). If they choose to disobey those regulations, then they are in the wrong regardless of whether or not they are using such frequencies.

>>Sure you make the relays
>>kerchunk and the circuits operate but the "owner" of that repeater
>>is the responsible party to ensure an access arrangement that is
>>private enough to eliminate those that s/he doesn't want to operate
>>the private repeater.

>

>...and it is this that the open repeater partisans are arguing against.

Again, I think you are incorrect because I think that what you call "open repeater partisans" are actually saying that closed repeater operators SHOULD incorporate such protections to prevent unwanted use of their equipment.

>>As others have pointed out, this is really poor engineering ...

>...but that requires that the repeater be closed, and that goes against the
>arguments that the open repeater partisans are making.

See note above.

>...and so the person gets on the output and keeps Jim from using the repeater
>anyway, according to the arguments of the open repeater partisans. After all,
>he doesn't own the frequency, right? Bah!

Unpleasant to you, apparently, but true. However, what is the likelihood that someone will fillibuster endlessly on Jim's output and render his repeater unusable for all time? As was pointed out countless times in previous posts, the simplex user is frequency agile while the repeater is not. When the repeater comes up for use, the polite and decent thing is for the simplexers to move to another frequency. They don't HAVE to, and that is the point of the argument. If they don't, then they are jerks and possibly jammers, so a rule requiring them to do so would have little effect anyway.

>OK, so broaden the hypothetical to include people who don't like closed
>repeaters. There have been a few jammers on Jim's system who have done it
>because they didn't like closed repeaters.

Would a rule giving closed repeaters exclusive rights to a frequency have prevented this? A blanket party would likely be more effective. Laws would just waste Jim's time in fruitless court battles.

>Nobody is saying that transient users should be run off. Jim has said
>repeatedly that he's only concerned about those who wish to use the machine
>regularly but not support it like the rest of his users are doing.

Yes, and Jim sure sounds like a hell of a nice guy. Too bad there are so many more "experienced" amateurs around here that do not share his enlightenment.

>There are still plenty of open repeaters, especially on 2 meters. If I travel,

>and take my 440 handheld with me, I expect to have to tune around a while to
>find a repeater I can use - regardless of open/closed status, I'd have to tune
>around anyway. What's the difference?

The fact is, even here in LA where the UHF/VHF is arguably the most crowded in the world, I have no problem making the contacts I want to on open repeaters. Many "private" repeaters here are "friendly" and welcome users as long as they do not abuse the system. Other friends of mine with closed systems are happy to let me use them, since when I do so it is usually to contact them anyway. Closed systems like Cactus are in heavy use, so I have no complaints that they are closed. Hey, if I want to use such sophisticated hardware, why shouldn't I contribute to its upkeep and expansion? There are, unfortunately, a large number of closed systems in LA that are not utilized. These systems seem to exist solely as security blankets for their owners/users who get a sense of safety from knowing that they would not have to wait to use the machine if they wanted to. Not that they seem to ever want to.

-grl.

Date: 5 Jan 1993 18:05:59 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1ialnnINnt37@transfer.stratus.com>, <8323@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1993Jan5.165651.28417@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <1993Jan5.165651.28417@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>The problem is, all the other lanes are blocked by other peoples' parked
>Porsches as well, and there are very few open lanes left.

Only on that one freeway. There are other freeways that go from the same place
to the same place, and that are wide open.

>>Fortunately, the FCC disagrees with you.
>Actually, I think the FCC prohibits exclusive "ownership" of a frequency pair.
>They agree that you don't have to let someone else use your EQUIPMENT if you
>don't want to.

The problem is that this leads to interference, and forcing someone to accept
interference to his repeater violates the agreement that let the ham community
tell him where to put it in the first place - "If you put your repeater here,
with these technical limits, we'll keep everyone else away" - and that's the
entire basis for frequency coordination in the first place. Now, we get back

to lawsuits. I still haven't heard anyone volunteer to pick up the legal expenses for coordinating bodies that try this.

>>Actually, no, they don't. Their license fee goes strictly towards the expenses
>>of processing their license. Nothing more.

>How do you know this? My impression was that broadcasters pay a LOT for their
>license, more than could possibly be required for processing.

- 1) The cost of processing is the basis for ALL FCC license fees, by law.
- 2) Broadcast licenses require tons of paperwork - one application I heard about recently ran over 500 pages - and that takes a LOT of processing.

>I didn't get this message at all. I thought that Mark was demanding that Jim
>park his Porsche in the garage when he is not using it so that a public bus
>could use the lane. It also seems Mark and others understand that when Jim is
>ready to go somewhere, he has first dibs on the lane (as long as he doesn't
>"run the bus off the road").

...but this is the rub: Jim _doesn't_ have "first dibs on the lane" if he has to wait for the bus to lumber out of the way. You've just damaged, if not destroyed, the usefulness of his repeater.

>Neither Mark nor most of the other "anti-closed" posters have been advocating
>that all repeaters be made open. It is the FREQUENCY space we are talking about,
>not the machinery.

The two are inseparable.

>If a repeater that can cause so much mayhem is left un-
>protected on a frequency where anyone can access it, then that is just plain
>stupid. At the very least it should be protected by DTMF access.

That's why they're closed: to protect the repeater, its users, and the users affected by that repeater's other facilities.

>Again, you seem to be (deliberately?) misunderstanding the messages. It's not
>use of the machine that is the issue, just use of the frequency.

The two are inseparable.

>Mark isn't advocating it, it's just that the regs allow it and that's the
>unfortunate truth. Even if the regs did allow exclusive ownership of a
>frequency pair, there is nothing to prevent some miscreant from doing it. It's
>called jamming and it renders many repeaters here unusable too, even open
>ones. But guess what, they can't keep it up 24 hours/day so the repeaters are
>eventually usable.

Why is jamming acceptable if it's in the form of an open repeater and its

partisans jamming a closed repeater, but not if someone jams an open repeater?

>***Note for Tad*** Gee, I didn't need to be an Extra or copy 50 wpm to read
>and understand what these guys were saying. Maybe you should make your posts
>in CW so that only your friends will be able to participate.

For the record, I disagree with Tad's comment about your experience level and
your qualifications to discuss this issue; indeed, it is vital that new hams
understand the history and legitimacy of closed repeaters, lest wars start
anew.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of all Fears_

Date: 5 Jan 1993 23:12:42 GMT

From: noc.near.net!transfer.stratus.com!bigbootay.sw.stratus.com!

leadfoot@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8323@lib.tmc.edu>, <1icr4sINNl08@transfer.stratus.com>,
<8339@lib.tmc.edu>a

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <8339@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

|> [Followups to .policy...]

|>

|> In article <1icr4sINNl08@transfer.stratus.com>

leadfoot@bigbootay.sw.stratus.com (Mark Curtis) writes:

|> >Except he isn't the only person parking in the lanes. Hundreds of others

|> >have the same idea. Nobody has a problem with them using the road to drive

|> >on, it's using it for a private parking lot when they aren't that we have

|> >a problem with.

|>

|> So use the next road over that has plenty of open lanes, and goes the same

|> places.

Because YOU'RE wasting everyone else's time, and access just so that you
don't have to be bothered to do what everyone else does, share the road.
You don't want to be bothered with the problems of sharing so you squat
down and claim that lane is your private lane. You don't own the lane,
it's public property built and paid for with public tax money. All you
own is the car. Your 30k wheels will not impress me, the cops, or the
tow truck driver.

|> Who says he's not using it just because it isn't moving? He could be waiting
|> for a passenger he's made an appointment to go to dinner with.

Hello McFly! Knock Knock, anyone home in there. Thats what they make
curb parking spaces for. How dim can you be?

|> So? The repeater is useless without a fixed frequency on which to find it, and
|> to force him to share the frequency without his consent hinders his ability to
|> use his property.

Tough! Thats life in the real world. This is ham radio not a private
common carrier. Sharing, interference, and waiting are all part of
ham radio. You're using the wrong radio service if you think you own
any frequency. Get a business frequency license if you want a frequency
all to yourself, in the ham radio service you have to share.

|> [BBQ grill analogy posted for the second time deleted]

Deleted because you can't come up with anything to counter it.

|> A barbecue grill doesn't lose its utility if you pick it up and move it. A
|> repeater does.

You don't have to move it, just turn it off when you're done talking and
quit crying about having to share. Everyone has to share the frequencies
in ham radio.

|> Besides, the situation is more like the city telling you that you can build
|> that grill there, and keep others from using it, and then telling you after
|> you've built a \$10K grill complete with smokers, rotisseries, and gold-plated
|> tongs that now you have to let everyone use it. Is that fair?

The repeater coordinator didn't own the frequencies either. He didn't
have to right to "give it to you" in the first place. Good thing he
wasn't selling land he didn't own, the courts love people who do that.

|> If I were to follow your words, then someone who doesn't like me or my
|> repeater can force me to keep it off the air, thus depriving me of the use of
|> it. Is that fair?

Get a business license if you can't handle sharing. Didn't your parents
teach you anything about getting along in the real world? Sharing is
like saying please, it gets you a long ways for very little.

|> Under the rules by which a LOT of repeaters were coordinated, they do in fact
|> own that frequency.

No they don't. The coordinator doesn't doesn't have the right to give

them to anyone. He doesn't own them either. He is just a self appointed person who tries to keep the various repeaters out of each others hair. Something cooked up by the repeater owners to serve themselves. You may have volunteered to go along with it, but I didn't. Only the FCC can assign frequencies to stations, something they refuse to do in the ham radio service. Sharing is part of the deal.

|> Want to put up a repeater? Try 220, or 900, or 1200;
|> there's plenty of spectrum out there just begging to be used.

144/220/450 are all filled here. 1280 is doing real well too! Scanning around on 450 is like looking for water in the desert. There may be a little chatter here and there, but most of the repeaters are dead quiet.

220 and 1280 are my main two bands. 144 and 450 usually aren't worth the trouble. 900 is a joke. Too much interference to and from all the new consumer/computer toys. Hams are about fourth fiddle on that band. In some parts of the country you can't even use 900 because of military activity.

Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1993 07:10:02 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8323@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan5.165651.28417@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>,
<8333@lib.tmc.edu>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <8333@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>Only on that one freeway. There are other freeways that go from the same place
>to the same place, and that are wide open.

That is a really good point. Too bad that here in LA the Porsche owners who park on 440 have put their BMWs on 1.2 GHz. All the 220 MHz pairs are gone, and the new low power allocations on 220 are likely to wipe out some existing repeaters.

>>>Fortunately, the FCC disagrees with you. ...
>The problem is that this leads to interference, and forcing someone to accept
>interference to his repeater violates the agreement that let the ham community
>tell him where to put it in the first place - "If you put your repeater here,
>with these technical limits, we'll keep everyone else away" - and that's the
>entire basis for frequency coordination in the first place. Now, we get back
>to lawsuits. I still haven't heard anyone volunteer to pick up the legal
>expenses for coordinating bodies that try this.

If it leads to interference, then someone is doing something wrong. I agree. I have only seen discussion of use of repeater frequencies abiding by the rules (non-interference). Has there been discussion of otherwise?

>1) The cost of processing is the basis for ALL FCC license fees, by law.
>2) Broadcast licenses require tons of paperwork - one application I heard
>about recently ran over 500 pages - and that takes a LOT of processing.

I believe you, thanks for the clarification.

>> ... It also seems Mark and others understand that when Jim is
>>ready to go somewhere, he has first dibs on the lane (as long as he doesn't
>>"run the bus off the road").

>...but this is the rub: Jim _doesn't_ have "first dibs on the lane" if he has
>to wait for the bus to lumber out of the way. You've just damaged, if not
>destroyed, the usefulness of his repeater.

Hmmmmmm.... There are many OPEN repeaters here that are often in use, forcing
a user to have to wait his or her turn to make a contact. There are also CLOSED
repeaters here on which users have to wait for other users to finish before they
can make a contact. It seems that those repeaters are still VERY useful. In fact
one of the reasons for the wait is BECAUSE they are so useful.

I bet Jim's system is so busy that users do have to wait to use it. What do you
say, Jim?

>>It is the FREQUENCY space we are talking about, not the machinery.

>The two are inseperable.

I disagree. A repeater I use must sometimes be shut-off because of some
unlicensed punks who insist on using it (a private repeater, BTW, that welcomes
non-member users. I am a member). In that state we still use the output freq-
uency for simplex QSOs. Having the repeater shut off does not seem to affect
the frequency at all.

>>If a repeater that can cause so much mayhem is left unprotected...

>That's why they're closed: to protect the repeater, its users, and the users
>affected by that repeater's other facilities.

But being closed doesn't protect the repeater. CLOSED is just a label. It is
the restrictions to access by requiring use of codes and such that protects
the repeater. You could protect an open repeater that way too.

>Why is jamming acceptable if it's in the form of an open repeater and its

>partisans jamming a closed repeater, but not if someone jams an open repeater?

I don't understand the question. I recall nothing about jamming acceptable in any form. Maybe you misunderstood what I meant. I was trying to say that if someone wants to jam your repeater by transmitting (presumably with high power) on the output frequency, no rule _prevents_ them from doing so. OPEN, CLOSED, they are just labels. If they key up, they jam you. Frequency ownership by a private repeater does not offer security from those intent on jamming, for whatever reason.

-grl.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #6
